



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,568	09/15/2003	Steven Z. Wu	50623.335	2840
<div>7590      04/04/2007</div> <div>Cameron K. Kerrigan Squire, Sanders &amp; Dempsey L.L.P. Suite 300 One Maritime Plaza San Francisco, CA 94111-3492</div>			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>SHEIKH, HUMERA N</div> <div>ART UNIT      PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>1615</div>	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/04/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/663,568	WU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of the Application**

Receipt of the Response and Amendment after Non-Final Office Action and Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, all filed 12/21/06 is acknowledged.

Claims 25-33 are pending in this action. Claims 1-24 have previously been cancelled. Claim 32 has been amended herein to correct a typographical error. Claims 25-33 remain rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**Claims 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang *et al.* (WO 01/01890 A1).**

The instant invention is drawn to a drug-loaded stent, comprising: a radially expanded stent body, a coating layer disposed on the stent body, and polymeric particles containing a therapeutic substance embedded within the coating layer.

**Yang *et al.* (WO '890)** teach stents having polymeric coatings for controllably releasing an active agent, methods for coating a stent and methods for inhibiting restenosis (see Abstract and Claims). The stent has a stent body, a coating disposed over at least a portion of the body, and an active agent releasably dispersed in at least part or portion of the coating. The coating can include a blend of first and second co-polymers. (page 3, line 22 – pg. 4, line 6). The stent

can be coated by spraying the stent with a solution or dispersion of polymer, active agent and solvent. The solvent can be evaporated, leaving a coating of polymer and active agent. The active agent can be dissolved and/or dispersed in the polymer. In some embodiments, the copolymers can be extruded over the stent body (pg. 4, lines 12-16).

Yang *et al.* teach at page 7, lines 9-10, that a therapeutic agent can be incorporated into a polymer and applied to the stent as a polymeric surface treatment. Drugs and treatments utilize anti-thrombogenic agents, anti-angiogenesis agents, anti-proliferative agents, growth factors and radiochemicals. Specific examples of therapeutic agents are disclosed on page 7, lines 15-17. In a preferred embodiment, the active agent or therapeutic substance is a restenosis-inhibiting agent (pg. 9, lines 3-4). Processes for surface treatment are disclosed on page 7, lines 18-23. Suitable polymeric materials are disclosed at page 6, line 17 – pg. 7, line 4).

With regard to Applicant's limitations of claims 27 and 33, that recite that the "coating layer is free from any therapeutic substance", the Examiner notes that Yang *et al.* at page 3, lines 22-24, teach that the 'active agent is releasably dispersed in at least part or portion of the coating', thus indicating that the drug is not necessarily entirely released in the coating layer. Hence, this teaching of Yang *et al.* would sufficiently meet the limitations of instant claims 27 and 33.

With regard to the particle size of 0.5 to 2 microns claimed in claim 29., the Examiner points out that suitable or effective particle sizes could be determined by one of ordinary skill in the art through the use of routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are indeed variable parameters attainable within the art. No unexpected results have been observed, which accrue from the instantly claimed particle size.

It is the position of the Examiner that given the explicit teachings of Yang *et al.*, the instant invention, when taken as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**Claims 25, 26, 28, 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,464,650).**

The instant invention is drawn to a drug-loaded stent, comprising: a radially expanded stent body, a coating layer disposed on the stent body, and polymeric particles containing a therapeutic substance embedded within the coating layer.

**Berg *et al.* ('650)** teach a drug-containing expandable stent and method for making an intravascular stent by applying to the body of a stent a solution, which includes a solvent, a polymer dissolved in the solvent and a therapeutic substance dispersed in the solvent and then evaporating the solvent. The inclusion of a polymer in intimate contact with a drug on the stent allows the drug to be retained on the stent during expansion of the stent and also controls the administration of the drug following implantation (see Abstract, Claims and column 2, lines 30-40). The method can be applied by immersing the stent into the solution or by spraying the solution onto the stent (col. 2, lines 40-44). Processes for preparing the coated stent are also disclosed on column 3, line 52 – col. 4, line 34, wherein it is taught that a solution, which includes a solvent, polymer dissolved in the solvent and a therapeutic substance dispersed in the solvent is first prepared. The solution is applied to the stent and the solvent is allowed to evaporate, thereby leaving on the stent surface a coating of the polymer and the therapeutic

Art Unit: 1615

substance. The intravascular stents of Berg *et al.* are directed towards reducing the incidence of restenosis (col. 1, lines 9-67).

Suitable polymers are disclosed at column 4, line 35 – col. 5, line 7. Suitable therapeutic substances are disclosed at column 2, lines 55-62.

With regard to the particle size of 0.5 to 2 microns claimed in claim 29., the Examiner points out that suitable or effective particle sizes could be determined by one of ordinary skill in the art through the use of routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are indeed variable parameters attainable within the art. No unexpected results have been observed, which accrue from the instantly claimed particle size.

Thus, it is the position of the Examiner that given the explicit teachings of Berg *et al.*, the instant invention, when taken as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

▪ **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yang et al. (WO 01/01890):**

Applicant argued, "Yang do not teach, expressly or inherently, adding polymeric particles containing a therapeutic substance embedded in a coating. There is no indication by Yang or the Examiner that the surface treatment techniques cited on p. 7 of Yang would result in the formation of polymer particles containing a therapeutic agent embedded in the coating.

Although Yang teaches that active agent can be dispersed in the polymer of a coating, there is no express or inherent teaching that the dispersed active agent is within polymeric particles. Additionally, although Yang teaches that the coating can include a blend of first and second co-polymers, there is no teaching or suggestion that the blend includes particles of one polymer dispersed within the other.”

These arguments have been fully considered, but were not persuasive. Since Applicant has not defined the size of the polymer particles, the Examiner refers to the teaching of Yang, who uses both hydrophilic and hydrophobic polymers. The active agent is released from the polymer upon the use of a hydrophobic polymer in the solvent. It is the Examiner’s position that there is a dispersion and not a solution resulting in polymer particles. Furthermore, it is the Examiner’s position that the drug is also dispersed within the polymer mixture. Yang permits the formation of solutions and dispersions. Note that Yang teach hydrophilic and hydrophobic polymers; essentially two embodiments. It is the second embodiment (of a hydrophobic polymer) that the Examiner is relying upon. Applicant’s claims fail to recite any particle size. Thus, Applicant’s arguments were not persuasive.

▪ **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Berg et al. (US 5,464,650).**

Applicant argued, ”Berg do not teach, expressly or inherently, polymeric particles containing a therapeutic substance embedded in a coating. Berg teach preparing a solution with a ‘polymer dissolved in a solvent’ (col. 3, line 54), applying the solution to a stent, and then allowing the solution to evaporate. (col. 4, lines 19-20). There is no teaching or suggestion of applying a solution of polymeric particles to a stent.

Berg do teach coating a stent with a solution containing solvent with a therapeutic substance ”dispersed in fine particles.” (col. 3, line 64). In addition, Example 2 of Berg teaches dipping a stent in a ”solution with suspended particles of dexamethasone.” (col. 5, lines 60-61) However, there is no indication by Berg or the Examiner that a coating with polymeric particles containing therapeutic agent embedded in the coating is formed. Thus, there is no express or inherent teaching or suggestion that the dispersed therapeutic agent is within polymer particles.

As with Yang, the Examiner states a conclusion of a prima facie case of obvious without providing any support or argument for it. The ”explicit teachings” of Berg do not teach all the claim limitations. Furthermore, the Examiner has provided no motivation or suggestion to modify Berg so that it teaches the above-mentioned claim limitations.”



Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but were not persuasive. Berg, at column 5, lines 12-18, is suggestive of a polymeric matrix formed in a solution that traps the drug depending on the ratio of the therapeutic substance to polymeric agent. Furthermore, the Examiner points out that there is no degree of drug loading recited in the claims. Thus, Applicant's arguments were not found persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



**Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Humera N. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-0604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00A.M. to 5:30P.M., alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Humera N. Sheikh  
Primary Examiner

  
HUMERA N SHEIKH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1615

April 02, 2007

*hns*